arXiv:1208.4928v1 [math.AP] 24 Aug 2012

Boundary regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the magnetohydrodynamic equations

Kyungkeun Kang and Jae-Myoung Kim

Abstract

We present some new regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of magnetohydrodynamic equations near boundary in dimension three. We prove that suitable weak solutions are Hölder continuous near boundary provided that either the scaled $L^{p,q}_{x,t}$-norm of the velocity with $3/p + 2/q \le 2$, $2 < q < \infty$, or the scaled $L^{p,q}_{x,t}$-norm of the vorticity with $3/p + 2/q \le 3$, $2 < q < \infty$ are sufficiently small near the boundary.

1 Introduction

We study the regularity problem for *suitable* weak solutions $(u, b, \pi) : Q_T \to \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}^3 \times \mathbb{R}$ of the three-dimensional incompressible magnetohydrodynamic (MHD) equations

$$\begin{cases} u_t - \triangle u + (u\cdot\nabla)u - (b\cdot\nabla)b + \nabla\pi = 0 \\ b_t - \triangle b + (u\cdot\nabla)b - (b\cdot\nabla)u = 0 \\ \text{div } u = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad \text{div } b = 0, \\ u(x,0) = u_0(x), \quad b(x,0) = b_0(x) \end{cases} \qquad \text{in } \ Q_T := \mathbb{R}^3_+ \times [0, T). \tag{1.1}$$

Here u is the flow velocity vector, b is the magnetic vector and $\pi = p + \dfrac{|b|^2}{2}$ is the magnetic pressure. The boundary conditions of u and b are given as no-slip and slip conditions, respectively, namely

$$u = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad b\cdot\nu = 0, \ \ (\nabla\times b)\times\nu = 0, \qquad \text{on } \ \partial\mathbb{R}^3_+, \tag{1.2}$$

where $\nu = (0, 0, -1)$ is the outward unit normal vector along boundary $\partial\mathbb{R}^3_+$. By suitable weak solutions we mean solutions that solve MHD equations in the sense of distribution and satisfy the local energy inequality (see Definition 2.1 in section 2 for details).

The MHD equations describe the dynamics of the interaction of moving conducting fluids with electro-magnetic fields which are frequently observed in nature and industry, e.g., plasma liquid metals, gases, two-phase mixtures (see e.g. [2] and [3]).

Let $x = (x_1, x_2, 0) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^3_+$. For a point $z = (x, t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^3_+ \times (0, T)$, we denote

$$B_{x,r} =: \{y \in \mathbb{R}^3 : |y - x| < r\}, \quad B^+_{x,r} := \{y \in B_{x,r} : y_3 > 0\},$$

$$Q_{z,r} =: B_{x,r} \times (t - r^2, t), \quad Q^+_{z,r} := \{(y, t) \in Q_{z,r} : y_3 > 0\}, \quad r < \sqrt{t}.$$

We say that solutions u and b are regular at $z \in \overline{\mathbb{R}^3_+} \times (0, T)$ if u and b are Hölder continuous for some $Q^+_{z,r}$, $r > 0$. Otherwise, it is said that u and b are singular at z.

We list some known results for MHD equations relevant to our concern, in particular regarding regularity conditions in terms of scaled invariant quantities.

It was shown in [3] that weak solutions for MHD equations exist globally in time and in the two-dimensional case weak solutions become regular (compare to [18] and [12] for the NSE). In the three-dimensional case, as shown in [28], if a weak solution pair $(u,\, b)$ are additionally in $L^\infty(0,\, T; H^1(\mathbb{R}^3))$, $(u,\, b)$ become regular. Although many significant contributions have been made on the existence, uniqueness and regularity of weak solutions to the MHD equations, as in the NSE, regularity question, however, remains open in dimension three.

In case that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$, it was proved in [10] that a weak solution pair (u, b) become regular if a certain type of scaling invariant integral conditions for velocity field, often referred as Serrin's condition, is additionally assumed (see e.g. [22], [29], [16], [5], [30] for the NSE). Recently, the authors have obtained similar results in the case that Ω is a bounded domain or half space (see [14, Theorem 1]) (refer to [6] for the NSE). The local interior case of Serrin's condition including limiting case $L^{3,\infty}_{x,t}$ was treated for MHD equations in [20] (compare to [4], [21] for the NSE).

For a local case, various types of $\epsilon-$regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions have been also established in terms of scaled norms. Among others, it was shown in [36] that suitable weak solutions become regular near a boundary point z if the following conditions are satisfied: There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{1}{r} \int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |\nabla b(y, s)|^2 dyds < \infty, \qquad \limsup_{r\to 0} \frac{1}{r} \int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |\nabla u(y, s)|^2 dyds < \epsilon.$$

Other types of conditions in terms of scaled invariant norms near boundary are also found in [35] (compare to [24], [26], [13], [31], [8], [27], [38] for the NSE). We also refer to [11], [15] and [34] in the interior case for MHD equations (compare to [23], [1], [32], [33], [19], [17], [9] for the NSE).

Here we emphasize that for the global case, i.e. $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3$, additional conditions are imposed on only velocity field but not on the magnetic field. For local interior and boundary cases, however, known results require control of some scaled norms with scaled factors of magnetic fields as well as those of the velocity fields.

The motivation of our study is to establish new regularity criteria for MHD equations depending only on velocity fields for local cases. To be more precise, main objective of this paper is to present new sufficient conditions, not relying on magnetic fields, for the regularity of suitable weak solutions to the MHD equations near boundary as well as in the interior.

While preparing this paper, the authors have become to know that, very recently, Wang and Zhang showed that local interior regularity can be ensured by the control of only scaled norm of velocity fields. More precisely, interior regularity criteria shown in [37] is the following:

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} r^{-(\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}-1)} \Big\| \|u\|_{L^p(B_{x,r})} \Big\|_{L^q(t-r^2,t)} < \epsilon, \tag{1.3}$$

where $1 \le \frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q} \le 2$ with $1 \le q \le \infty$. We have also proved independently the same result as in [37] and since we think that our proof is a different version to that in [37], its details are given in Appendix (see Theorem 4.1). Our main concern is, however, to obtain new regularity conditions near boundary. Let $x_0 \in \partial\mathbb{R}^3_+$ be a boundary point in a half space. We expect that our analysis would also hold in a smooth boundary as in the case of flat boundary, but our study is restricted, in this paper, to the case of $\mathbb{R}^3$, whose boundary is flat.

Now we are ready to state the first part of our main results.

Theorem 1.1 *Let* (u, b, π) *be a suitable weak solution of the MHD equations* (1.1) *according to Definition 2.1. Suppose that for every pair* p, q *satisfying* $\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q} \le 2$, $2 < q \le \infty$ *and* $(p,q) \ne (\frac{3}{2},\infty)$, *there exists* $\epsilon > 0$ *depending only on* p, q *such that for some point* $z = (x,t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^3_+ \times (0,T)$ u *is locally in* $L^{p,q}_{x,t}$ *near* z *and*

$$\limsup_{r\to 0} r^{-(\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}-1)} \Big\| \|u\|_{L^p(B^+_{x,r})} \Big\|_{L^q(t-r^2,t)} < \epsilon. \tag{1.4}$$

Then, u *and* b *are regular at* z.

Remark 1.1 *The result in Theorem 1.1 is also valid in the interior. In fact, the range of* q *in* (1.4) *in the interior is wider than that of boundary case. To be more precise, the pair* (p,q) *can be relaxed in the interior as follows:*

$$\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q} \le 2, \qquad 1 \le q \le \infty, \quad (p,q) \ne (\frac{3}{2},\infty).$$

As mentioned earlier, in [37] Wang and Zhang showed interior regularity criteria depending only on the control of velocity fields and we also obtain the same result independently. Since the method of proof is a bit different to that in [37], we present its details in the Appendix for a variety of proof.

Next corollaries are direct consequences of Theorem 1.1.

Corollary 1.1 *Let* (u, b, π) *be a suitable weak solution of the MHD equations* (1.1) *according to Definition 2.1. Suppose that for some point* $z = (x,t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^3_+ \times (0,T)$ u *is locally in* $L^{p,q}_{x,t}$ *near* z, *where* $\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q} = 1$ *with* $3 < p < \infty$. *Then,* u *and* b *are regular at* z.

It is straightforward to prove Corollary 1.1 by Hölder's inequality, and thus we skip its details (compare to [20] for local interior case). Next corollary is due to Poincaré-Sobolev inequality and the details is again omitted.

Corollary 1.2 *The same statement of Theorem 1.1 remains true if the hypothesis including condition* (1.4) *is replaced by the following: Suppose that for every pair* p, q *satisfying* $2 \leq \frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} \leq 3$, $2 < q \leq \infty$, *and* $(p, q) \neq (1, \infty)$, *there exists* $\epsilon > 0$ *depending only on* p, q *such that for some point* $z = (x, t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^3_+ \times (0, T)$ u *is locally in* $L^{p,q}_{x,t}$ *near* z *and*

$$\limsup_{r \to 0} r^{-(\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}-1)} \left\| \|\nabla u\|_{L^p(B^+_{x,r})} \right\|_{L^q(t-r^2,t)} < \epsilon. \tag{1.5}$$

Considering scaling invariant quantities of vorticity, we can also establish other regularity criteria for vorticity near boundary.

Theorem 1.2 *Let* (u, b, π) *be a suitable weak solution of the MHD equations* (1.1) *according to Definition 2.1. Suppose that for every pair* p, q *satisfying* $2 \leq \frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} \leq 3$, $2 < q \leq \infty$, *and* $(p, q) \neq (1, \infty)$, *there exists* $\epsilon > 0$ *depending only on* p, q *such that for some point* $z = (x, t) \in \partial\mathbb{R}^3_+ \times (0, T)$ $\omega = \nabla \times u$ *is locally in* $L^{p,q}_{x,t}$ *near* z *and*

$$\limsup_{r \to 0} r^{-(\frac{3}{p}+\frac{2}{q}-2)} \left\| \|\omega\|_{L^p(B^+_{x,r})} \right\|_{L^q(t-r^2,t)} < \epsilon. \tag{1.6}$$

Then, u *and* b *are regular at* z.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some scaling invariant functionals and the notion of suitable weak solutions. In Section 3 we present the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.2. In the Appendix, the interior case will be treated and give a detailed a proof with respect to ϵ-regularity criteria for the modified suitable weak solution for MHD equations.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we introduce some scaling invariant functionals and suitable weak solutions, and recall an estimation of the Stokes system.

We first start with some notations. Let Ω be an open domain in $\mathbb{R}^3$ and I be a finite time interval. For $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, we denote the usual Sobolev spaces by $W^{k,q}(\Omega) = \{u \in L^q(\Omega) : D^\alpha u \in L^q(\Omega), 0 \leq |\alpha| \leq k\}$. As usual, $W^{k,q}_0(\Omega)$ is the completion of $\mathcal{C}^\infty_0(\Omega)$ in the $W^{k,q}(\Omega)$ norm. We also denote by $W^{-k,q'}(\Omega)$ the dual space of $W^{k,q}_0(\Omega)$, where q and q' are Hölder conjugates. We write the average of f on E as $\fint_E f$, that is $\fint_E f = \int_E f / |E|$. For a function $f(x, t)$, we denote $\|f\|_{L^{p,q}_{x,t}(\Omega\times I)} = \|f\|_{L^q_t(I;L^p_x(\Omega))} = \|\|f\|_{L^p_x(\Omega)}\|_{L^q_t(I)}$. For vector fields u, v we write $(u_i v_j)_{i,j=1,2,3}$ as $u \otimes v$. We denote by $C = C(\alpha, \beta, ...)$ a constant depending on the prescribed quantities $\alpha, \beta, ...$, which may change from line to line.

In this paper, we consider the case that $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$, i.e. a half space in dimension three. For convenience, we denote the boundary of $\mathbb{R}^3_+$ by $\Gamma = \mathbb{R}^3 \cap \{x_3 = 0\}$. Next, we introduce scaling invariant quantities near boundary. Let $z = (x, t) \in \Gamma \times I$ and we set

$$A_u(r) := \sup_{t-r^2 \leq s < t} \frac{1}{r} \int_{B^+_{x,r}} |u(y, s)|^2 dy, \quad E_u(r) := \frac{1}{r} \int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |\nabla u(y, s)|^2 dyds,$$

$$A_b(r) := \sup_{t-r^2\le s<t} \frac{1}{r}\int_{B^+_{x,r}} |b(y,s)|^2 dy, \quad E_b(r) := \frac{1}{r}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |\nabla b(y,s)|^2 dyds,$$

$$M_u(r) := \frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |u(y,s)|^3 dyds, \quad M_b(r) := \frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |b(y,s)|^3 dyds,$$

$$K_b(r) := \frac{1}{r^3}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |b(y,s)|^2 dyds,$$

$$(u)_r(s) := \fint_{B^+_{x,r}} u(\cdot,s)dy, \quad (b)_r(s) := \fint_{B^+_{x,r}} b(\cdot,s)dy, \quad (\pi)_r(s) = \fint_{B^+_{x,r}} \pi(y,s)dy,$$

$$G_{u,p,q}(r) := r^{1-\frac{3}{p}-\frac{2}{q}} \|u(y,s)\|_{L^{p,q}_{y,s}(Q^+_{z,r})}, \quad D_{u,\tilde p,q}(r) := r^{2-\frac{3}{\tilde p}-\frac{2}{q}} \|\nabla u(y,s)\|_{L^{\tilde p,q}_{y,s}(Q^+_{z,r})},$$

$$V_{u,\tilde p,q}(r) := r^{2-\frac{3}{\tilde p}-\frac{2}{q}} \|\omega(y,s)\|_{L^{\tilde p,q}_{y,s}(Q^+_{z,r})}, \qquad \omega = \nabla\times u,$$

where $1\le p,q\le\infty$, $3/\tilde p + 2/q = 3$ and $1/p = 1/\tilde p - 1/3$,

$$\tilde Q(r) := \frac{1}{r}\Big(\int_{t-r^2}^t \Big(\int_{B^+_{x,r}} |\pi(y,s)-(\pi)_r(s)|^{\kappa^*} dy\Big)^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa^*}} ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}},$$

$$Q(r) := \frac{1}{r}\Big(\int_{t-r^2}^t \Big(\int_{B^+_{x,r}} |\pi(y,s)|^{\kappa^*} dy\Big)^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa^*}} ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}},$$

$$Q_1(r) := \frac{1}{r}\Big(\int_{t-r^2}^t \Big(\int_{B^+_{x,r}} |\nabla\pi(y,s)|^{\kappa} dy\Big)^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa}} ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}},$$

where κ, κ^* and λ are numbers satisfying

$$\frac{3}{\kappa} + \frac{2}{\lambda} = 4, \quad \frac{1}{\kappa^*} = \frac{1}{\kappa} - \frac{1}{3}, \quad 1<\lambda<2. \tag{2.1}$$

Next we recall suitable weak solutions for the MHD equations (1.1) in three dimensions.

Definition 2.1 *Let $\Omega = \mathbb{R}^3_+$ and $Q_T = \mathbb{R}^3_+ \times [0,T)$. A triple of (u,b,π) is a suitable weak solution to (1.1) if the following conditions are satisfied:*

(a) The functions $u, b : Q_T \to \mathbb{R}^3$ and $\pi : Q_T \to \mathbb{R}$ satisfy

$$u, b \in L^\infty\big(I; L^2(\Omega)\big) \cap L^2\big(I; W^{1,2}(\Omega)\big), \quad \pi \in L^\lambda\big(I; L^{\kappa^*}(\Omega)\big),$$

$$\nabla^2 u, \nabla^2 b \in L^\lambda\big(I; L^k(\Omega)\big), \quad \nabla\pi \in L^\lambda\big(I; L^\kappa(\Omega)\big),$$

where κ, κ^* and λ are numbers in (2.1).

(b) (u,b,π) solves the MHD equations in Q_T in the sense of distributions and u and b satisfy the boundary conditions (1.2) in the sense of traces.

(c) u, b and π satisfy the local energy inequality

$$\int_{B^+_{x,r}} (|u(x,t)|^2 + |b(x,t)|^2)\phi(x,t)dx$$

$$+2\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{B^+_{x,r}} (\left|\nabla u(x,t')\right|^2 + \left|\nabla b(x,t')\right|^2)\phi(x,t')dxdt'$$

$$\leq \int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{B^+_{x,r}} (|u|^2 + |b|^2)(\partial_t\phi + \Delta\phi)dxdt' + \int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{B^+_{x,r}} \left(|u|^2 + |b|^2 + 2\pi\right) u\cdot\nabla\phi dxdt'$$

$$-2\int_{t_0}^{t}\int_{B^+_{x,r}} (b\cdot u)(b\cdot\nabla\phi)dxdt'. \tag{2.2}$$

for all $t \in I = (0,T)$ and for all nonnegative function $\phi \in C_0^\infty(\mathbb{R}^3 \times R)$.

We consider the following Stokes system, which is the linearized Navier-Stokes equations:

$$v_t - \Delta v + \nabla p = f, \quad \operatorname{div} v = 0 \qquad \text{in } \; Q_T := \Omega \times (0,T) \tag{2.3}$$

with initial data $v(x,0) = v_0(x)$. As in (1.2), boundary condition of v is assumed to be no-slip, namely $v(x,t) = 0$ for $x \in \partial\Omega$. We recall maximal estimates of the Stokes system in terms of mixed norms (see e.g. [6, Theorem 5.1]).

Lemma 2.1 *Let $1 < l, m < \infty$. Suppose that $f \in L^{l,m}_{x,t}(Q_T)$ and $v_0 \in D_l^{1-\frac{1}{m},m}$, where $D_l^{1-\frac{1}{m},m}$ is a Banach space with the following norm :*

$$D_l^{1-\frac{1}{m},m}(\Omega) := \left\{ w \in L^l_\sigma(\Omega); \|w\|_{D_l^{1-\frac{1}{m},m}} = \|w\|_{L^l} + \left(\int_0^\infty \left\|t^{\frac{1}{m}} A_l e^{-tA_l} w\right\|^m_{L^l} \frac{dt}{t}\right)^{\frac{1}{m}} < \infty \right\},$$

where A_l is the Stokes operator(see [7] for the details). If (v,p) is the solution of the Stokes system (2.3) with no-slip boundary conditions, then the following estimate is satisfied:

$$\|v_t\|_{L^{l,m}_{x,t}(Q_T)} + \left\|\nabla^2 v\right\|_{L^{l,m}_{x,t}(Q_T)} + \|\nabla p\|_{L^{l,m}_{x,t}(Q_T)}$$

$$\leq C\|f\|_{L^{l,m}_{x,t}(Q_T)} + \|v_0\|_{D_l^{1-\frac{1}{m},m}(\Omega)}. \tag{2.4}$$

3 Boundary regularity

In this section, we prove a local regularity criterion for MHD equations near the boundary and present the proofs of Theorem 1.1 and 1.2. For simplicity, we write $\Psi(r) := A_u(r) + A_b(r) + E_u(r) + E_b(r)$. Let $z = (x,t) \in \Gamma \times I$ and from now on, without loss of generality, we assume $x = 0$ by translation. We first recall that the local energy estimate.

$$\Psi(\frac{r}{2}) \leq C\left(M_u^{\frac{2}{3}}(r) + K_b(r) + M_u(r) + \frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |u|\,|b|^2\,dz + \frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |u|\,|\pi|\,dz\right). \quad (3.1)$$

Next we prove a local regularity condition near boundary for MHD equations (compare to [8, Lemma 7] for the Navier-Stokes equations).

Proposition 3.1 *There exist $\epsilon^* > 0$ and $r_0 > 0$ such that if (u, b, π) is a suitable weak solution of MHD equations satisfying Definition 2.1, $z = (x, t) \in \Gamma \times I$, and*

$$M_u(r) + M_b(r) + \tilde{Q}(r) < \epsilon^* \qquad \text{for some } r \in (0, r_0), \quad (3.2)$$

then z is regular point.

The proof of Proposition 3.1 is based on the following lemma, which shows a decay property of (u, b, π) in a Lebesgue spaces. Although the method of proof is in principle the similar as in [8, Lemma 7, Lemma 8], we present its details for clarity (the proof will be given in Appendix).

Lemma 3.1 *Let $0 < \theta < \frac{1}{2}$. There exist $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and r_* depending on λ and θ such that if (u, b, π) is a suitable weak solution of the MHD equations satisfying Definition 2.1, $z = (x, t) \in \Gamma \times (0, T)$, and $M_u^{\frac{1}{3}}(r) + M_b^{\frac{1}{3}}(r) + \tilde{Q}(r) < \epsilon_1$ for some $r \in (0, r_*)$, then*

$$M_u^{\frac{1}{3}}(\theta r) + M_b^{\frac{1}{3}}(\theta r) + \tilde{Q}(\theta r) < C\theta^{1+\alpha}\left(M_u^{\frac{1}{3}}(r) + M_b^{\frac{1}{3}}(r) + \tilde{Q}(r)\right),$$

where $0 < \alpha < 1$ and $C > 0$ are constants.

Next lemma is estimates of the scaled integral of cubic term of u and multiple of u and square of b.

Lemma 3.2 *Let $z = (x, t) \in \Gamma \times I$. Suppose that $u \in L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})$ with $3/p + 2/q = 2$, $3/2 \leq p \leq \infty$. Then for $0 < r < \rho/4$,*

$$M_u(r) \leq CG_{u,p,q}(r)\Psi(r) \leq C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\Psi(\rho)G_{u,p,q}(r), \quad (3.3)$$

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |u|\,|b|^2\,dz \leq CG_{u,p,q}(r)\Psi(r) \leq C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)\Psi(\rho)G_{u,p,q}(r). \quad (3.4)$$

Proof. It is sufficient to show estimate (3.4) because (3.3) can be proved in the same way as (3.4). We note first that via Hölder's inequality

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |u|\,|b|^2\,dxds \leq \frac{1}{r}\|u\|_{L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})}\frac{1}{r}\|b\|^2_{L^{2p^*,2q^*}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})}, \quad (3.5)$$

where p^* and q^* are Hölder conjugates of p and q. For $\alpha := (3-p^*)/2p^*$ we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\|b\|_{L^{2p^*}_x(B^+_{x,r})} &\le \|b\|^{\alpha}_{L^2_x(B^+_{x,r})}\|b-(b)_r\|^{1-\alpha}_{L^6_x(B^+_{x,r})} + \|b\|^{\alpha}_{L^2_x(B^+_{x,r})}\|(b)_r\|^{1-\alpha}_{L^6_x(B^+_{x,r})}\\ &\le C\|b\|^{\alpha}_{L^2_x(B^+_{x,r})}\|\nabla b\|^{1-\alpha}_{L^2_x(B^+_{x,r})} + \|b\|_{L^2_x(B^+_{x,r})} r^{-\frac{1}{2}+\frac{\alpha}{2}},\end{aligned}$$

where we used Poincaré inequality. Taking L^{2q^*} norm in temporal variable and using Young's inequality,

$$\|b\|^2_{L^{2p^*,2q^*}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})} \le C\|b\|^2_{L^{2,\infty}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})} + C\|\nabla b\|^2_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})}.$$

Recalling (3.5), we can have

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}} |u|\,|b|^2\,dxds \le CG_{u,p,q}(r)\Psi(r) \le C(\frac{\rho}{r})\Psi(\rho)G_{u,p,q}(r).$$

This completes the proof. ☐

Next, we may continue with scaled norm of $L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z_0,r})$ estimate of b.

Lemma 3.3 *Let $z=(x,t)\in\Gamma\times I$. Suppose that $u\in L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})$ with $3/p+2/q=2$ and $3/2\le p<3$. Then for $0<r<\rho/4$*

$$K_b(r) \le C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^3 G^2_{u,p,q}(\rho)\Psi(\rho) + C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^2 K_b(\rho). \qquad (3.6)$$

Proof. For convenience, we write $x=(x_1,x_2,x_3)=(x',x_3)$ and by translation, we assume that without loss of generality, $z=(0,0)\in\Gamma\times I$. Let $\zeta(x,t)$ be a standard cut off function supported in Q_ρ such that $\zeta(x,t)=1$ in $Q_{\rho/2}$. We set $g(x,t) := -\nabla\cdot([u\otimes b - b\otimes u]\zeta)$ in $Q^+_{z,\rho}$ and we then define $\tilde{g}(x,t)$, an extension of g from Q^+_ρ onto Q_ρ, in the following way: $\tilde{g}(x,t)=g(x,t)$ if $x_3\ge 0$. On the other hand, if $x_3<0$, then

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{g}_i(x',x_3,t) &= g_i(x',-x_3,t), \qquad i=1,2\\ \tilde{g}_3(x',x_3,t) &= -g_3(x',-x_3,t).\end{aligned}$$

This can be done by extending tangential components of u and b as even functions and normal components of u and b as odd functions, respectively. We denote such extensions by $\tilde{u}$ and $\tilde{b}$ for simplicity. Here we also used the fact that ζ and $\nabla'\zeta$ are even and $\partial_{x_3}\zeta$ is odd with respect to x_3-variable, where $\nabla'=(\partial_{x_1},\partial_{x_2})$.

Next, we define $\tilde{w}(x,t)$ for $(x,t)\in\mathbb{R}^3\times(-\infty,0)$ by

$$\tilde{w}(x,t) = \int_{-\infty}^{t}\int_{\mathbb{R}^3}\frac{1}{(4\pi(t-s))^{\frac{3}{2}}}e^{-\frac{|x-y|^2}{4(t-s)}}\tilde{g}(y,s)dyds,$$

namely, $\tilde{w}$ satisfies

$$\tilde{w}_t - \Delta\tilde{w} = \tilde{g} \qquad \text{in } \mathbb{R}^3\times(-\infty,0).$$

Moreover, we can see that $\partial_{x_3}\tilde{w}_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $\tilde{w}_3 = 0$ on $\{x_3 = 0\}$. Let $h = b - \tilde{w}$ in Q^+_ρ. Then h satisfies

$$h_t - \Delta h = 0 \qquad \text{in } Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$$

and $\partial_{x_3}h_i = 0$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $h_3 = 0$ on $\{x_3 = 0\} \cap Q_\rho$. Now we extend h by the same manner as g, denoted by $\tilde{h}$, from $Q^+_{\rho/2}$ onto $Q_{\rho/2}$. We then see that

$$\tilde{h}_t - \Delta \tilde{h} = 0 \qquad \text{in } Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}}.$$

Via classical regularity theory, we have

$$\int_{Q_r} |\tilde{h}|^2 dz \le C(\frac{r}{\rho})^5 \int_{Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}}} |\tilde{h}|^2 dz. \tag{3.7}$$

On the other hand, due to Sobolev embedding, we have $\|\tilde{w}\|_{L^2(B_\rho)} \le \|\tilde{w}\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^3)} \le C\|\nabla\tilde{w}\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5}}(\mathbb{R}^3)}$ and we then take L^2 integration for the above in time interval $(-\rho^2, 0)$ such that we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}\|\tilde{w}\|_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q_\rho)} &\le C\|\nabla\tilde{w}\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5},2}_{x,t}(\mathbb{R}^3\times(-\rho^2,0))} \le C\|\tilde{u}\tilde{b}\zeta\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5},2}_{x,t}(\mathbb{R}^3\times(-\rho^2,0))} \\ &\le C\|\tilde{u}\tilde{b}\|_{L^{\frac{6}{5},2}_{x,t}(Q_\rho)} \le C\|\tilde{u}\|_{L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q_\rho)}\|\tilde{b}\|_{L^{\alpha,\beta}_{x,t}(Q_\rho)},\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

where $3/\alpha + 2/\beta = 3/2$ and $2 \le \alpha < 6$, since $3/2 \le p < 3$. Using the estimate (3.8) and Sobolev inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{\rho^3}\|\tilde{w}\|^2_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} &\le C\frac{1}{\rho^2}\|\tilde{u}\|^2_{L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q_\rho)}\frac{1}{\rho}\|\tilde{b}\|^2_{L^{\alpha,\beta}_{x,t}(Q_\rho)} \le C\frac{1}{\rho^2}\|u\|^2_{L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}\frac{1}{\rho}\|b\|^2_{L^{\alpha,\beta}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)} \\ &\le \frac{C}{\rho^2}\|u\|^2_{L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}(A_b(\rho) + E_b(\rho)) \le CG^2_{u,p,q}(\rho)\Psi(\rho).\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

Combining estimates (3.7) and (3.9), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}K_b(r) = \frac{1}{r^3}\|b\|^2_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q^+_r)} &\le \frac{1}{r^3}\|\tilde{w}\|^2_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q_r)} + \frac{1}{r^3}\|\tilde{h}\|^2_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q_r)} \\ &\le C(\frac{\rho}{r})^3G^2_{u,p,q}(\rho)\Psi(\rho) + C(\frac{r}{\rho})^2\frac{1}{\rho^3}\|b\|^2_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} \\ &\le C(\frac{\rho}{r})^3G^2_{u,p,q}(\rho)\Psi(\rho) + C(\frac{r}{\rho})^2K_b(\rho).\end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

In next lemma we show an estimate of the gradient of pressure (compare to [8, Lemma 11]).

Lemma 3.4 *Let* $z=(x,t)\in\Gamma\times I$*. Then for* $0<r<\rho/4$*,*

$$Q_1(r)\le C\Big(\frac{\rho}{r}\Big)\Big(A_u^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho)E_u^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)+A_b^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho)E_b^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)\Big)$$

$$+C\Big(\frac{r}{\rho}\Big)\Big(E_u^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho)+Q_1(\rho)\Big), \tag{3.10}$$

where κ *and* λ *are numbers in* (2.1)*.*

Proof. We assume, via translation, that $z=(x,t)=(0,0)$. We choose a domain $\tilde{B}^+$ with a boundary such that $B^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}}\subset\tilde{B}^+\subset B^+_\rho$, and we denote $\tilde{Q}^+:=\tilde{B}^+\times(-\rho^2,0)$. Let (v,π_1) be the unique solution of the following the Stokes system

$$v_t-\Delta v+\nabla\pi_1=-(u\cdot\nabla)u+(b\cdot\nabla)b,\quad \operatorname{div}v=0\ \text{ in } \tilde{Q}^+,$$

$$(\pi_1)_{\tilde{B}^+}=\fint_{\tilde{B}^+}\pi_1(y,t)dy=0,\quad t\in(-\rho^2,0),$$

$$v=0\quad \partial\tilde{B}^+\times[-\rho^2,0],\quad v=0\quad \tilde{B}^+\times\{t=-\rho^2\}.$$

Using the Stokes estimate (2.4), we have the following estimate

$$\begin{aligned}
&\frac{1}{\rho^2}\|v\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)}+\frac{1}{\rho}\|\nabla v\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)}+\|v_t\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)}+\|\nabla^2 v\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)}\\
&\qquad+\frac{1}{\rho}\|\pi_1\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)}+\|\nabla\pi_1\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)}\\
&\le C\Big(\|(u\cdot\nabla)u\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)}+\|(b\cdot\nabla)b\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)}\Big)\\
&\le C\Big(\|(u\cdot\nabla)u\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}+\|(b\cdot\nabla)b\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}\Big)\\
&\le C\big(\rho A_u^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho)E_u^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)+\rho A_b^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho)E_b^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)\big),
\end{aligned}$$

where we used the following estimates in last inequality above:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|(u\cdot\nabla)u\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}+\|(b\cdot\nabla)b\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}\\
&\le\|u\|^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{\kappa}}_{L^{2,\infty}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}\|\nabla u\|^{\frac{2}{\lambda}}_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}+\|b\|^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{\kappa}}_{L^{2,\infty}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}\|\nabla b\|^{\frac{2}{\lambda}}_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)}\\
&\le C\rho A_u^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{\kappa}}(\rho)E_u^{\frac{2}{\lambda}}(\rho)+C\rho A_b^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{\kappa}}(\rho)E_b^{\frac{2}{\lambda}}(\rho).
\end{aligned}$$

Next, let $w=u-v$ and $\pi_2=\pi-(\pi)_{B^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}}}-\pi_1$. Then (w,π_2) solves the following the boundary value problem:

$$w_t-\Delta w+\nabla\pi_2=0,\quad \operatorname{div}w=0\qquad \text{in } \tilde{Q}^+,$$

$$w=0\quad \text{ on } (\partial\tilde{B}^+\cap\{x_3=0\})\times[-\rho^2,0].$$

Now we take κ' such that $3/\kappa' + 2/\lambda = 2$. Then from the local estimate near the boundary for the Stokes systems (see [25]), we obtain

$$\|\nabla^2 w\|_{L^{\kappa',\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{4}})} + \|\nabla \pi_2\|_{L^{\kappa',\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{4}})}$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{\rho^2}\left(\frac{1}{\rho^2}\|w\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} + \frac{1}{\rho}\|\nabla w\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} + \frac{1}{\rho}\|\pi_2\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})}\right)$$

$$\leq \frac{C}{\rho^2}\left(\frac{1}{\rho}\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} + \|\nabla \pi\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} + \frac{1}{\rho}\|\nabla v\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})} + \frac{1}{\rho}\|\pi_1\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})}\right),$$

where Poincaré-Sobolev inequality is used. Since $\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)} \leq C\rho^2 E_u^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho)$, we have

$$\|\nabla \pi_2\|_{L^{\kappa',\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{\frac{\rho}{4}})} \leq \frac{C}{\rho^2}\left(\rho E_u^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho) + \rho Q_1(\rho) + \rho A_u^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_u^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho) + \rho A_b^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_b^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)\right)$$

$$= \frac{C}{\rho}\big(E_u^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho) + Q_1(\rho) + A_u^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_u^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho) + A_b^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_b^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)\big).$$

Let $0 \leq r \leq \rho/4$. Noting that $\|\nabla \pi_2\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_r)} \leq Cr^2 \|\nabla \pi_2\|_{L^{\kappa',\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_r)}$, we have

$$Q_1(r) = \frac{1}{r}\|\nabla \pi\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_r)} \leq \frac{1}{r}\big(\|\nabla \pi_1\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_r)} + \|\nabla \pi_2\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_r)}\big)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{r}\big(\|\nabla \pi_1\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_\rho)} + r^2\|\nabla \pi_2\|_{L^{\kappa',\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_r)}\big)$$

$$\leq C(\frac{\rho}{r})\big(A_u^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_u^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho) + A_b^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_b^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)\big)$$

$$+C(\frac{r}{\rho})\big(E_u^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho) + Q_1(\rho) + A_u^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_u^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho) + A_b^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_b^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)\big)$$

$$\leq C(\frac{\rho}{r})\Big(A_u^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_u^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho) + A_b^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{2\kappa}}(\rho) E_b^{\frac{1}{\lambda}}(\rho)\Big) + C(\frac{r}{\rho})\Big(E_u^{\frac{1}{2}}(\rho) + Q_1(\rho)\Big).$$

This completes the proof. □

We remark that, via Young's inequality, (3.10) can be estimated as follows:

$$Q_1(r) \leq C\left(\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right) + \left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)\right)\Psi(\rho) + C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)(Q_1(\rho) + 1)\,. \tag{3.11}$$

Next lemma shows an estimate of a scaled norm of pressure.

Lemma 3.5 *Let $z = (x,t) \in \Gamma \times I$. Suppose that $\nabla \pi \in L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q_\rho)$ and $\pi \in L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q_\rho)$, where $3/\kappa + 2/\lambda = 4$, $1/\kappa^* = 1/\kappa - 1/3$ and $1 < \lambda < 2$. Then for $0 < r < \rho/4$,*

$$Q(r) \leq C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right) Q_1(\rho) + C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1} Q(\rho). \tag{3.12}$$

Proof. Since $1 < \lambda < 2$, we note that $\frac{3}{2} < \kappa^* < 3$. We first observe that due to Hölder inequality

$$\|(\pi)_\rho\|_{L_x^{\kappa^*}(B^+_{x,r})} \le C(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}}\|\pi\|_{L_x^{\kappa}(B^+_{x,\rho})}.$$

Therefore, due to Poincaré-Sobolev inequality, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\|\pi\|_{L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})} &\le \|\pi-(\pi)_\rho\|_{L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})} + \|(\pi)_\rho\|_{L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})}\\ &\le C\|\nabla\pi\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})} + C(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}}\|\pi\|_{L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,\rho})}.\end{aligned}$$

Dividing both sides by r, we have

$$\frac{1}{r}\|\pi\|_{L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})} \le C(\frac{\rho}{r})\frac{1}{\rho}\|\nabla\pi\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,\rho})} + C(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1}\frac{1}{\rho}\|\pi\|_{L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,\rho})}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

We are ready to present the proof of Theorem 1.1.

Proof of Theorem 1.1. We note first that via Hölder's inequality, it suffices to show the case that $3/p+2/q=2$, $2<q<\infty$. Recalling Lemma 3.4 and Lemma 3.5, we have

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q^+_{z,r}}|u|\,|\pi|\,dz &\le \frac{1}{r}\,\|u\|_{L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})}\,\frac{1}{r}\,\|\pi\|_{L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{z,r})}\\ &\le C\epsilon\left((\frac{\rho}{r})Q_1(\frac{\rho}{2}) + (\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1}Q(\frac{\rho}{2})\right)\\ &\le C\epsilon\left((\frac{\rho}{r})^2+1\right)\Psi(\rho) + C\epsilon\left(Q_1(\rho)+1\right) + C\epsilon(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1}Q(\rho),\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where (3.11) is also used. With aid of Lemma 3.2, Lemma 3.3, (3.11) and (3.13), we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Psi(\frac{r}{2}) &\le C\epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}(\frac{\rho}{r})^{\frac{2}{3}}\Psi^{\frac{2}{3}}(\rho) + C\epsilon(\frac{\rho}{r})\Psi(\rho) + C\epsilon^2(\frac{\rho}{r})^3\Psi(\rho) + C(\frac{r}{\rho})^2K_b(\rho)\\ &\quad + C\epsilon\big((\frac{\rho}{r})^2+1)\big)\Psi(\rho) + C\epsilon(Q_1(\rho)+1) + C\epsilon(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1}Q(\rho)\\ &\le C\left[\epsilon^2(\frac{\rho}{r})^3 + \epsilon(\frac{\rho}{r})^2 + (\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\epsilon)(\frac{\rho}{r}) + \epsilon + (\frac{r}{\rho})^2\right]\Psi(\rho)\\ &\quad + C\epsilon Q_1(\rho) + C\epsilon + C\epsilon(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1}Q(\rho),\end{aligned} \tag{3.14}$$

where we used the Young's inequality and $K_b(\rho) \le \Psi(\rho)$. Let ϵ_1 and ϵ_2 be small positive numbers, which will be specified later.

Adding $\epsilon_1 Q_1(\frac{r}{2})$ and $\epsilon_2 Q(\frac{r}{2})$ to both sides in (3.14), and using (3.11) and Lemma 3.5, we obtain

$$\Psi(\frac{r}{2}) + \epsilon_1 Q_1(\frac{r}{2}) + \epsilon_2 Q(\frac{r}{2})$$

$$\leq C\left[\epsilon^2\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^3+\epsilon(\frac{\rho}{r})^2+(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\epsilon)(\frac{\rho}{r})+\epsilon+(\frac{r}{\rho})^2\right]\Psi(\rho)$$

$$+C\epsilon Q_1(\rho)+C\epsilon+C\epsilon(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1}Q(\rho)+C\epsilon_1\left[(\frac{\rho}{r})+(\frac{r}{\rho})\right]\Psi(\rho),$$

$$+C\epsilon_1(\frac{r}{\rho})(Q_1(\rho)+1)+C\epsilon_2(\frac{\rho}{r})Q_1(\rho)+C\epsilon_2(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1}Q(\rho)$$

$$\leq C\left[\epsilon^2(\frac{\rho}{r})^3+\epsilon(\frac{\rho}{r})^2+(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{2}}+\epsilon+\epsilon_1)(\frac{\rho}{r})+\epsilon+(\frac{r}{\rho})^2+\epsilon_1(\frac{r}{\rho})\right]\Psi(\rho)$$

$$+C\left[\epsilon+\epsilon_1(\frac{r}{\rho})+\epsilon_2(\frac{\rho}{r})\right]Q_1(\rho)+C(\epsilon+\epsilon_2)\frac{r}{\rho}^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1}Q(\rho)+C\left[\epsilon+\epsilon_1(\frac{r}{\rho})\right].$$

We fix $\theta\in(0,\frac{1}{4})$ with $C(\theta+\theta^{\frac{3}{\kappa^*}-1})<\frac{1}{4}$ and then choose ϵ_1,ϵ_2 and ϵ satisfying

$$0<\epsilon_1<\frac{\theta}{16C},\qquad 0<\epsilon_2<\frac{\epsilon_1\theta}{8C},\qquad 0<\epsilon<\min\left\{\frac{\epsilon^*}{16C},\ \epsilon_2,\ \frac{\theta^6}{16C^2}\right\}.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\Psi(\theta r)+\epsilon_1 Q_1(\theta r)+\epsilon_2 Q(\theta r)\leq\frac{\epsilon^*}{8}+\frac{1}{2}\Big(\Psi(r)+\epsilon_1 Q_1(r)+\epsilon_2 Q(r)\Big).\tag{3.15}$$

Iterating (3.15), we can see that there exists a sufficiently small $r_0>0$ such that for all $r<r_0$

$$\Psi(r)+\epsilon_1 Q_1(r)+\epsilon_2 Q(r)\leq\frac{\epsilon^*}{4}.$$

Therefore, we conclude that $\Psi(r)\leq\epsilon^*/8$. Next, we use the estimates (3.11) and (3.12) to obtain that there is $r_1>0$ such that $Q(r)\leq\epsilon^*/4$ for all $r<r_1$. This can be shown by the method of iterations as in (3.15). Summing up, we obtain $\Psi(r)+Q(r)\leq\epsilon^*/2$ for all $r<r_1$, which implies the regularity condition in Proposition 3.1. This completes the proof. □

The proof of Theorem 1.2 is given below.

Proof of Theorem 1.2. As mentioned earlier, it suffices to show the case that $3/p+2/q=3$, $2<q<\infty$. We first show that the gradient of velocity is controlled by vorticity. To be more precise, we prove the following estimate (compare to [9, Lemma 3.6]):

$$D_{u,\tilde{p},q}(r)\leq C(\frac{\rho}{r})V_{u,\tilde{p},q}(\rho)+C(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\tilde{p}}-1}D_{u,\tilde{p},q}(\rho).\tag{3.16}$$

Indeed, let ξ be a cut off supported in Q_ρ and $\xi=1$ in $Q_{\frac{\rho}{2}}$. We consider

$$\begin{cases}-\Delta v=\nabla\times(\omega\xi) & \text{in}\quad\mathbb{R}^3_+\\ v=0\quad\text{on}\quad\{x_3=0\}\end{cases}$$

and set $h=u-v$. So h is harmonic function in $B^+_{\frac{r}{2}}$ with $h=0$ on $\partial B^+_{\frac{r}{2}}\cap\{x_3=0\}$. By the mean value theorem of harmonic functions and L^p estimates of elliptic equations for each fixed time t

$$\|\nabla h\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_r)}\le C(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\tilde p}}\|\nabla h\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_{\frac{\rho}{2}})}\le C(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\tilde p}}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_\rho)}+\|\nabla v\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_\rho)}\right)$$
$$\le C(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\tilde p}}\left(\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_\rho)}+\|\ \omega\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_\rho)}\right).$$

Adding together above estimates,

$$\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_r)}\le\|\nabla v\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_r)}+\|\nabla h\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_r)}\le C\|\ \omega\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_r)}+C(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{3}{\tilde p}}\|\nabla u\|_{L^{\tilde p}_x(B^+_\rho)}.$$

Taking L^q-norm in time and dividing both sides by r, we obtain (3.16). Via the method of iteration, the estimate implies that the scaled norm of gradient of velocity becomes sufficiently small. Since argument is straightforward, we skip its details. We deduce the Theorem via Corollary 1.2. □

4 Appendix

In this Appendix we present the proof of Lemma 3.1 and interior regularity is compared to boundary regularity given in Theorem 1.1.

4.1 Proof of Lemma 3.1

As mentioned earlier, the method of proof is quite similar to that of [8, Lemma 8] and main difference is mostly caused by the presence of magnetic field b. Therefore, we give the mainstream of the proof, instead giving all the details.

Proof of Lemma 3.1. For convenience, we denote $\phi(r):=M_u^{\frac{1}{3}}(r)+M_b^{\frac{1}{3}}(r)+\tilde Q(r)$. Suppose the statement is not true. So for any $\alpha\in(0,1)$ and $C>0$, there exist $z_n=(x_n,t_n)$, $r_n\searrow 0$ and $\epsilon_n\searrow 0$ such that

$$\phi(r_n)=\epsilon_n,\qquad \phi(\theta r_n)>C\theta^{1+\alpha}\phi(r_n)=C\theta^{1+\alpha}\epsilon_n.$$

Let $w=(y,s)$ where $y=\frac{(x-x_n)}{r_n}$, $s=\frac{(t-t_n)}{r_n^2}$ and we define v_n,b_n and π_n as follows:

$$v_n(w)=\frac{r_n}{\epsilon_n}u(z),\quad b_n(w)=\frac{r_n}{\epsilon_n}b(z),\quad \pi_n(w)=\frac{r_n^2}{\epsilon_n}(\pi(z)-(\pi)_{B^+_{r_n}}(z)).$$

We also introduce some scaling invariant functionals defined by

$$T_u(v_n,\theta):=\frac{1}{\theta^2}\int_{Q^+_\theta}|v_n|^3dw,\quad T_b(b_n,\theta):=\frac{1}{\theta^2}\int_{Q^+_\theta}|b_n|^3dw,$$

$$P_1(\pi_n,\theta):=\frac{1}{\theta}\Big(\int_{-\theta^2}^0\Big(\int_{B^+_\theta}|\nabla\pi_n|^\kappa dy\Big)^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa}}ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}},$$

$$\tilde{P}(\pi_n, \theta) := \frac{1}{\theta}\Big(\int_{-\theta^2}^{0}\Big(\int_{B_\theta^+} |\pi_n - (\pi_n)_{B_\theta^+}|^{\kappa^*} dy\Big)^{\frac{\lambda}{\kappa^*}} ds\Big)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}},$$

where κ^*, κ and λ are numbers in (2.1). Let $\tau_n(\theta) = T_u^{\frac{1}{3}}(v_n, \theta) + T_b^{\frac{1}{3}}(b_n, \theta) + \tilde{P}(\pi_n, \theta)$. The change of variables lead to

$$\tau_n(1) = \|v_n\|_{L^{3,3}_{x,t}(Q_1^+)} + \|b_n\|_{L^{3,3}_{x,t}(Q_1^+)} + \|\pi_n\|_{L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q_1^+)} = 1, \quad \tau_n(\theta) \geq C\theta^{1+\alpha}. \tag{4.1}$$

On the other hand, v_n, b_n and π_n solve the following system in a weak sense:

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s v_n - \Delta v_n + \epsilon_n (v_n \cdot \nabla) v_n - \epsilon_n (b_n \cdot \nabla) b_n + \nabla \pi_n = 0, \quad \text{div } v_n = 0 & \text{in } Q_1^+, \\ \partial_s b_n - \Delta b_n + \epsilon_n (v_n \cdot \nabla) b_n - \epsilon_n (b_n \cdot \nabla) u_n = 0, \quad \text{div } b_n = 0 & \text{in } Q_1^+, \end{cases}$$

with boundary data $v_n = 0$, $b_n \cdot \nu = 0$ and $(\nabla \times b_n) \times \nu = 0$ on $B_1 \cap \{x_3 = 0\} \times (-1, 0)$. Since $\tau_n(1) = 1$, we have following weak convergence:

$$v_n \rightharpoonup u \quad \text{in } L^{3,3}_{x,t}(Q_1^+), \qquad b_n \rightharpoonup b \quad \text{in } L^{3,3}_{x,t}(Q_1^+), \qquad \pi_n \rightharpoonup \pi \quad \text{in } L^{\kappa^*,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q_1^+),$$

and $(\pi)_{B_1^+}(s) = 0$. Moreover, we note that $\partial_s v_n$ and $\partial_s b_n$ are uniformly bounded in $L^\lambda\big((-1, 0); (W^{2,2}(B_1^+))'\big)$, respectively and we also have

$$\partial_s v_n \rightharpoonup \partial_s u, \quad \partial_s b_n \rightharpoonup \partial_s b \qquad \text{in } L^\lambda\big((-1, 0); (W^{2,2}(B_1^+))'\big), \tag{4.2}$$

Using the local energy inequality (2.2), ∇v_n and ∇b_n are uniformly bounded in $L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q_{3/4}^+)$, which implies

$$v_n \rightharpoonup u, \quad b_n \rightharpoonup b \qquad \text{in } W^{1,2}(Q_{3/4}^+). \tag{4.3}$$

Its verification is rather standard, we skip its details (compare to [8, Lemma 8]).

We note that u, b and π solve the following linear Stokes system

$$\begin{cases} \partial_s u - \Delta u + \nabla \pi = 0, \quad \text{div } u = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1^+, \\ \partial_s b - \Delta b = 0, \quad \text{div } b = 0 \quad \text{in } Q_1^+, \end{cases}$$

with boundary data $u = 0$, $b \cdot \nu = 0$ and $(\nabla \times b) \times \nu = 0$ on $B_1 \cap \{x_3 = 0\} \times (-1, 0)$. We can show that

$$\partial_s v_n,\ \partial_s b_n,\ \Delta v_n,\ \Delta b_n,\ \nabla \pi_n \rightharpoonup \partial_s u,\ \partial_s b,\ \Delta u,\ \Delta b, \nabla \pi \quad \text{in } L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q_{5/8}^+). \tag{4.4}$$

Indeed, due to Hölder inequality, we see that

$$\||(v_n \cdot \nabla) v_n| + |(b_n \cdot \nabla) b_n| + |(v_n \cdot \nabla) b_n| + |(b_n \cdot \nabla) v_n|\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q_{3/4}^+)}$$

$$\leq C(\|\nabla v_n\|^{\frac{2}{\lambda}}_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q_{3/4}^+)} + \|\nabla b_n\|^{\frac{2}{\lambda}}_{L^{2,2}_{x,t}(Q_{3/4}^+)})(\|v_n\|^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{\kappa}}_{L^{2,\infty}_{x,t}(Q_{3/4}^+)} + \|b_n\|^{\frac{3-2\kappa}{\kappa}}_{L^{2,\infty}_{x,t}(Q_{3/4}^+)}). \tag{4.5}$$

Using the local estimates of Stokes system and heat equations near boundary,

$$\begin{aligned}
&\| |\partial_s v_n| + |\partial_s b_n| + \left|\nabla^2 v_n\right| + \left|\nabla^2 b_n\right| + |\nabla \pi_n| \|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{5/8})}\\
&\le C\| |v_n| + |b_n| + |\nabla v_n| + |\nabla b_n| + |\pi_n| \|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{3/4})}\\
&+C\epsilon_n(\||(v_n\cdot\nabla)v_n| + |(b_n\cdot\nabla)b_n| + |(v_n\cdot\nabla)b_n| + |(b_n\cdot\nabla)v_n|\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{3/4})}).
\end{aligned}$$

We note that, due to (4.5), the righthand side of the above estimate is bounded by $C(1+\epsilon_n)$.

According to estimates of the perturbed stokes system near boundary in [27], u, b are Hölder continuous in $Q^+_{1/2}$ with the exponent α with $0<\alpha<2(1-1/\lambda)$. Here we fix $\alpha_0 = 1-1/\lambda$. Then, by Hölder continuity of u, b and strong convergence of the L^3-norm of v_n, b_n, we obtain

$$T_u(v_n,\theta)\to T_u(u,\theta),\ \ T_b(b_n,\theta)\to T_b(b,\theta),\quad T_u^{\frac{1}{3}}(u,\theta)+T_b^{\frac{1}{3}}(b,\theta)\le C_1\theta^{1+\alpha_0}. \tag{4.6}$$

Next we need to estimate $\tilde{P}(\pi_n,\theta)$. Let $\tilde{B}^+$ be a domain with smooth boundary such that $B^+_{11/16}\subset\tilde{B}^+\subset B^+_{3/4}$, and $\tilde{Q}^+ := \tilde{B}^+\times(-(3/4)^2,0)$. Now we consider the following initial and boundary problem of $\bar{v}_n, \bar{b}_n, \bar{\pi}_n$

$$\begin{gathered}
\partial_s\bar{v}_n - \Delta\bar{v}_n + \nabla\bar{\pi}_n = -\epsilon_n(\bar{v}_n\cdot\nabla)\bar{v}_n + \epsilon_n(\bar{b}_n\cdot\nabla)\bar{b}_n,\quad \operatorname{div}\bar{v}_n = 0 \qquad \text{in } \tilde{Q}^+,\\
(\bar{\pi}_n)_{\tilde{B}^+}(s) = 0,\quad s\in(-(\frac{3}{4})^2,0),\\
\bar{v}_n = 0\quad \text{on } \partial\tilde{B}^+\times[-(\frac{3}{4})^2,0],\qquad \bar{v}_n = 0\quad \text{on } \tilde{B}^+\times\{s=-(\frac{3}{4})^2\}.
\end{gathered}$$

$$\begin{gathered}
\partial_s\bar{b}_n - \Delta\bar{b}_n = -\epsilon_n(\bar{v}_n\cdot\nabla)\bar{b}_n + \epsilon_n(\bar{b}_n\cdot\nabla)\bar{v}_n,\quad \operatorname{div}\bar{v}_n = 0 \qquad \text{in } \tilde{Q}^+,\\
\bar{b}_n\cdot\nu = 0,\ (\nabla\times\bar{b}_n)\times\nu = 0\quad \text{on } \partial\tilde{B}^+\times[-(\frac{3}{4})^2,0],\\
\bar{b}_n = 0\quad \text{on } \tilde{B}^+\times\{s=-(\frac{3}{4})^2\}.
\end{gathered}$$

Using the estimate of Stokes system in Lemma 2.1, we get

$$\begin{aligned}
&\|\partial_s\bar{v}_n\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)} + \|\partial_s\bar{b}_n\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(\tilde{Q}^+)} + \|\bar{v}_n\|_{L^{\kappa}((-(3/4)^2,0);W^{2,\lambda}_0(\tilde{B}^+))}\\
&\quad+\|\bar{b}_n\|_{L^{\kappa}((-(3/4)^2,0);W^{2,\lambda}_0(\tilde{B}^+))} + \|\bar{\pi}_n\|_{L^{\kappa}((-(3/4)^2,0);W^{1,\lambda}(\tilde{B}^+))}\\
&\le\epsilon_n(\|(\bar{v}_n\cdot\nabla)\bar{v}_n\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+)} + \|(\bar{b}_n\cdot\nabla)\bar{b}_n\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+)}\\
&\quad+\|(\bar{v}_n\cdot\nabla)\bar{b}_n\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+)} + \|(\bar{b}_n\cdot\nabla)\bar{v}_n\|_{L^{\kappa,\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+)}) \le C\epsilon_n.
\end{aligned}\tag{4.7}$$

Next, we define $\tilde{v}_n = v_n - \bar{v}_n$, $\tilde{b}_n = b_n - \bar{b}_n$ and $\tilde{\pi}_n = \pi_n - \bar{\pi}_n$. Then it is straightforward that $\tilde{v}_n$, $\tilde{b}_n$ and $\tilde{\pi}_n$ solve

$$\begin{cases}
\partial_s\tilde{v}_n - \Delta\tilde{v}_n + \nabla\tilde{\pi}_n = 0,\quad \operatorname{div}\,\tilde{v}_n = 0\quad \text{in } \tilde{Q}^+,\\
\partial_s\tilde{b}_n - \Delta\tilde{b}_n = 0,\quad \operatorname{div}\,\tilde{b}_n = 0\quad \text{in } \tilde{Q}^+,
\end{cases}$$

with boundary data $\tilde{v}_n = 0$, $\tilde{b}_n \cdot \nu = 0$ and $(\nabla \times \tilde{b}_n) \times \nu = 0$ on $B_1 \cap \{x_3 = 0\} \times (-1, 0)$. Using local estimates of Stokes system and heat equation near boundary, we then note that $\tilde{v}_n$, $\tilde{b}_n$ and $\tilde{\pi}_n$ satisfy

$$\|\nabla^2 \tilde{v}_n\|_{L^{\tilde{\kappa},\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{9/16})} + \|\nabla^2 \tilde{b}_n\|_{L^{\tilde{\kappa},\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{9/16})} + \|\nabla \tilde{\pi}_n\|_{L^{\tilde{\kappa},\lambda}_{x,t}(Q^+_{9/16})} \leq C(1 + \epsilon_n),$$

where $\tilde{\kappa}$ is the number with $3/\tilde{\kappa} + 2/\lambda = 1$.

Now, by the Poincaré inequality, we have

$$\tilde{P}(\pi_n, \theta) \leq C_2 \Big(\tilde{P}_1(\bar{\pi}_n, \theta) + \tilde{P}_1(\tilde{\pi}_n, \theta) \Big).$$

We note that $P_1(\bar{\pi}_n, \theta)$ goes to zero as $n \to \infty$ because of (4.7). On the other hand, using the Hölder's inequality, we have

$$P_1(\tilde{\pi}_n, \theta) \leq \theta^2 \bigg(\int_{-\theta^2}^{0} \Big(\int_{B^+_\theta} |\nabla \tilde{\pi}|^{\tilde{\kappa}} dy \Big)^{\frac{\lambda}{\tilde{\kappa}}} ds \bigg)^{\frac{1}{\lambda}} \leq C\theta^2 (1 + \epsilon_n).$$

Summing up above observations, we obtain

$$\liminf_{n \to \infty} \tilde{P}(\hat{\pi}_n, \theta) \leq \lim_{n \to \infty} C_2 \theta^2 (1 + \epsilon_n) \leq C_2 \theta^{1+\alpha_0}. \tag{4.8}$$

Consequently, if a constant C in (4.1) is taken bigger than $2(C_1 + C_2)$ in (4.6) and (4.8), this leads to a contradiction, since

$$2(C_1 + C_2)\theta^{1+\alpha_0} \leq C\theta^{1+\alpha_0} \leq \liminf_{n \to \infty} \tau_n(\theta) \leq (C_1 + C_2)\theta^{1+\alpha_0}.$$

This deduces the Lemma 3.1. □

Lemma 3.1 is the crucial part of the proof of Proposition 3.1 and since its verification is rather straightforward (compare to [8, Lemma 7]), the proof of Proposition 3.1 is omitted.

4.2 Interior regularity

In this subsection, we present an interior regularity condition (see Theorem 4.1) and give its proof. As mentioned in Introduction, we very recently became to know that the same result for interior case was obtained in [37]. However, since the proof of ours is different to that of [37], we give our proof.

We first state the main result for interior case.

Theorem 4.1 ***(Interior regularity)*** *Let* (u, b, π) *be a suitable weak solution of the MHD equations* (1.1) *in* $\mathbb{R}^3 \times I$. *Suppose that for every pair* p, q *satisfying* $1 \leq \frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} \leq 2$, $1 \leq q \leq \infty$, *there exists* $\epsilon > 0$ *depending only on* p, q *such that for some point* $z = (x, t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times I$ *with* u *is locally in* $L^{p,q}_{x,t}$ *and*

$$\limsup_{r \to 0} r^{-(\frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} - 1)} \Big\| \|u\|_{L^p(B_{x,r})} \Big\|_{L^q(t - r^2, t)} < \epsilon. \tag{4.9}$$

Then, u *and* b *are regular at* $z = (x, t)$

Compared to Theorem 1.1, we remark that the range of q in the interior is wider than that of the boundary case. This is mainly due to difference of estimates of the pressure for the interior and boundary cases. Since proof of interior case is simpler than the boundary case, we give the main stream of how the proof goes.

We first observe that the estimate (3.6) is also valid for the interior case for $1 \leq q \leq \infty$. Since its verification is rather straightforward, we just state and omit the details (see also [15, Lemma 3.7]).

Lemma 4.1 *Let* $z = (x,t) \in \mathbb{R}^3 \times I$. *Suppose that* $u \in L^{p,q}_{x,t}(Q_{z,r})$ *with* $\frac{3}{p} + \frac{2}{q} = 2$, $\frac{3}{2} \leq p \leq \infty$. *Then for* $0 < r \leq \rho/4$

$$K_b(r) \leq C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^3 G^2_{u,p,q}\Psi(\rho) + C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right)^2 K_b(\rho). \tag{4.10}$$

Next we estimate the pressure in the interior. We first introduce a useful invariant functional in the interior case defined as follows:

$$S(r) := \frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q_{z,r}} |\pi(y,s)|^{\frac{3}{2}} dyds.$$

Now we recall an estimate of the pressure involving the functional above and since its proof is given in [15, Lemma 3.3], we just state in the following lemma.

Lemma 4.2 *Let* $0 < r \leq \rho/4$ *and* $Q_\rho \subset \mathbb{R}^3 \times I$. *Then*

$$S(r) \leq C\left(\frac{\rho}{r}\right)^2 \Psi(\rho) + C\left(\frac{r}{\rho}\right) S(\rho). \tag{4.11}$$

The other estimates such as $M_u(r)$ and $\int_{Q_{z,r}} |u||b|^2 dxdt$ in Lemma 3.2 is also valid in the interior by following similar arguments, and thus we skip its details. Now we are ready to give the proof for Theorem 4.1. Here all invariant functionals in this subsection are defined over the interior parabolic balls.

Proof of Theorem 4.1. Under the hypothesis (4.9), recalling Lemma 4.1 and Lemma 3.2, we note first that for $4r < \rho$

$$K_b(r) \leq C\epsilon^2(\frac{\rho}{r})^3\Psi(\rho) + C(\frac{r}{\rho})^2 K_b(\rho) \leq C\left(\epsilon^2(\frac{\rho}{r})^3 + (\frac{r}{\rho})^2\right)\Psi(\rho), \tag{4.12}$$

$$M_u(r) + \frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q_{z,r}} |u|\,|b|^2\,dz \leq C\epsilon(\frac{\rho}{r})\Psi(\rho). \tag{4.13}$$

Next, due to the pressure estimate (4.11), we obtain

$$\frac{1}{r^2}\int_{Q_{z,r}} |u|\,|\pi|\,dz \leq M_u^{\frac{1}{3}}(r)S^{\frac{2}{3}}(r) \leq C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{\rho}{r})^{\frac{5}{3}}\Psi(\rho) + C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{1}{3}}\Psi^{\frac{1}{3}}(\rho)S^{\frac{2}{3}}(\rho)$$

$$\le C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{\rho}{r})^{\frac{5}{3}}\Psi(\rho) + C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{1}{3}}S(\rho), \tag{4.14}$$

where Young's inequality is used. Next, combining estimates (4.12)-(4.14), we have via the local energy inequality

$$\Psi(\frac{r}{2}) \le C\left(\epsilon^2(\frac{\rho}{r})^3 + (\frac{r}{\rho})^2\right)\Psi(\rho) + C\epsilon^{\frac{2}{3}}(\frac{\rho}{r})^{\frac{2}{3}}\Psi^{\frac{2}{3}}(\rho)$$

$$+ C\epsilon(\frac{\rho}{r})\Psi(\rho) + C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{\rho}{r})^{\frac{5}{3}}\Psi(\rho) + C\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{1}{3}}S(\rho) \tag{4.15}$$

where we used Young's inequality and $\frac{1}{r^3}\int_{Q_{z,r}}|u|^2 \le CM_u^{\frac{2}{3}}(r)$. Let ϵ_3 be a small positive number, which will be specified later. Now via estimates (4.11) and (4.15) we consider

$$\Psi(\frac{r}{2}) + \epsilon_3 S(\frac{r}{2}) \le \epsilon + C\left(\epsilon^2(\frac{\rho}{r})^3 + (\frac{r}{\rho})^2 + \epsilon_3(\frac{\rho}{r})^2\right)\Psi(\rho) + C\left(\epsilon^{\frac{1}{3}}(\frac{r}{\rho})^{\frac{1}{3}} + \epsilon_3(\frac{r}{\rho})\right)S(\rho),$$

where we used Young's inequality. We fix $\theta \in (0, \frac{1}{4})$ with $\theta < \frac{1}{8^3(C+1)^3}$ and then ϵ_3 and ϵ are taken to satisfy

$$0 < \epsilon_3 < \min\left\{\frac{\theta^2}{16C^2}\right\}, \qquad 0 < \epsilon < \min\left\{\frac{\epsilon^*}{4},\ \epsilon_3^3,\ \frac{\theta^{\frac{3}{2}}}{4C^{\frac{1}{2}}}\right\},$$

where ϵ^* is the number introduced in [15, Theorem 1.1]. We then obtain

$$\Psi(\theta r) + \epsilon_3 S(\theta r) \le \frac{\epsilon^*}{4} + \frac{1}{4}\Big(\Psi(r) + \epsilon_3 S(r)\Big).$$

Usual method of iteration implies that there exists a sufficiently small $r_0 > 0$ such that for all $r < r_0$

$$\Psi(r) + \epsilon_3 S(r) \le \frac{\epsilon^*}{2}.$$

This completes the proof. $\square$

Acknowledgments

K. Kang's work was partially supported by NRF-2012R1A1A2001373. J.-M. Kim's work was partially supported by KRF-2008-331-C00024 and NRF-2009-0088692. The authors wish to expresses our appreciation to Professor Tai-Peng Tsai for useful comments.

References

[1] L. Caffarelli, R. Kohn & L. Nirenberg *Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **35** (1982), no. 6, 771–831.

[2] P. A. Davidson An introduction to magnetohydrodynamics, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2001.

[3] G. Duvaut & J. L. Lions, *Inéquations en thermoélasticité et magnétohydrodynamique (French)*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal., **46** (1972), 241–279.

[4] L. Escauriaza, G. A. Seregin & V. Šverák, *$L^{3,\infty}$-solutions of Navier-Stokes equations and backward uniqueness* (Russian. Russian summary) Uspekhi Mat. Nauk **58** (2003), no. 2(350), 3–44; translation in Russian Math. Surveys **58** (2003), no. 2, 211–250.

[5] E. B. Fabes, B. F. Jones & N. M. Rivière, *The initial value problem for the Navier-Stokes equations with data in L^p*, Arch. Rat. Mech. Anal., **45**, (1972), 222–248.

[6] Y. Giga, *Solutions for semilinear parabolic equations in L^p and regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes system* J. Differential Equations, **62**, (1986), no. 2, 186–212.

[7] Y. Giga & H. Sohr, *Abstract L^p estimates for the Cauchy problem with applications to the Navier-Stokes equations in exterior domains*, J. Funct. Anal., **102** (1991), no. 1, 72–94.

[8] S. Gustafson, K. Kang & T.-P. Tsai *Regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations near the boundary*, J. Differential Equations, **226** (2006), no. 2, 594–618.

[9] S. Gustafson, K. Kang & T.-P. Tsai *Interior regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Math. Phys. **273** (2007), no. 1, 161–176.

[10] C. He & Z. Xin, *On the regularity of weak solutions to the magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Differential Equations, **213** (2005), no. 2, 235–254.

[11] C. He & Z. Xin, *Partial regularity of suitable weak solutions to the incompressible magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Funct. Anal., **227** (2005), no. 1, 113–152.

[12] E. Hopf *Über die Anfangswertaufgabe fur die hydrodynamischen Grundgleichungen.(German)*, Math. Nachr. **4** (1951), 213–231.

[13] K. Kang *On boundary regularity of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Partial Differential equations **29** (2004), no. 7-8 ,955–987.

[14] K. Kang & J.-M. Kim *Regularity criteria of the magenetohydrodynamic equations in bounded domains or a half space*, J. Differential Equations **253** (2012), no. 2, 764–794.

[15] K. Kang & J. Lee *Interior regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the magnetohydrodynamics equations*, J. Differential Equations **247** (2009), no. 8 ,2310–2330.

[16] O. A. Ladyžhenskaya, *Uniqueness and smoothness of generalized solutions of Navier-Stokes equations. (Russian)*, Zap. Naučn. Sem. Leningrad. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (LOMI), **5**, (1967), 169–185.

[17] O. A. Ladyžhenskaya & G. A. Seregin *On partial regularity of suitable weak solutions to the three-dimensional Navier-Stokes equations*, J. Math. Fluid Mech. **1** (1999), no. 4, 356–387.

[18] J. Leray *Essai sur le mouvement d'un fluide visqueux emplissant l'espace,* Acta Math., **63** (1934), no. 1, 193–248.

[19] F. Lin *A new proof of the Caffarelli-Kohn-Nirenberg theorem*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **51** (1998), no. 3, 241–257.

[20] A. Mahalov, B. Nicolaenko & T. Shilkin *$L_{3,\infty}$-solutions to the MHD equations*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) 336 (2006), Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Vopr. Teor. Funkts. 37, 112–132, 275–276; translation in J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) 143 (2007), no. 2, 2911–2923.

[21] A. S. Mikhailov & T. N. Shilkin *$L_{3,\infty}$ -solutions to the 3D-Navier-Stokes system in the domain with a curved boundary*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) **336** (2006), Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Vopr. Teor. Funkts. 37, 133–152, 276; translation in J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) **143** (2007), no. 2, 2924–2935.

[22] G. Prodi, *Un teorema di unicità per le equazioni di Navier-Stokes. (Italian)*, Ann. Mat. Pura Appl., **48**, (1959), 173-182.

[23] V. Scheffer *Partial regularity of solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations*, Pacific J. Math., **66** (1976), no 2, 535–552.

[24] V. Scheffer *Boundary regularity for the Navier-Stokes equations in a half-space*, Comm. Math. Phys., **85**, no. 2, (1982), 275–299.

[25] G. A. Seregin *Some estimates near the boundary for solutions to the non-stationary linearized Navier-Stokes equations*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) **271** (2000), Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Vopr. Teor. Funkts. 31, 204–223, 317; translation in J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) **115** (2003), no. 6, 2820–2831.

[26] G. A. Seregin *Local regularity of suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations near the boundary*, J. Math. Fluid Mech. **4** (2002), no. 1, 1–29.

[27] G. A. Seregin, T. N. Shilkin & V. A. Solonnikov *Boundary partial regularity for the Navier-Stokes equations*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) **310** (2004), Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Vopr. Teor. Funkts. 35 [34], 158–190, 228; translation in J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) **132** (2006), no. 3, 339–358.

[28] M. Sermange & R. Temam, *Some mathematical questions related to the MHD equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math., **36** (1983), no. 5, 635–664.

[29] J. Serrin *On the interior regularity of weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Arch. Rational Mech. Anal. **9** (1962) 187–195.

[30] H. Sohr, *Zur Regularitätstheorie der instationaren Gleichungen von Navier-Stokes. (German)*, Math. Z. **184**, (1983), no. 3, 359–375.

[31] V. A. Solonnikov *Estimates of solutions of the Stokes equations in S. L. Sobolev spaces with a mixed norm*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) **288** (2002), Kraev. Zadachi Mat. Fiz. i Smezh. Vopr. Teor. Funkts. 32, 204–231, 273–274; translation in J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) **123** (2004), no. 6, 4637–4653.

[32] M. Struwe *On partial regularity results for the Navier-Stokes equations*, Comm. Pure Appl. Math. **41** (1988), no. 4, 437–458.

[33] S. Takahashi, *On interior regularity criteria for weak solutions of the Navier-Stokes equations*, Manuscripta Math. **69**, (1990), no. 3, 237–254.

[34] V. Vyalov, *Partial regularity of solutions to the magnetohydrodynamic equations*, J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) **150** (2008), no. 1, 1771–1786.

[35] V. Vyalov, *On the local smoothness of weak solutions to the MHD system near the boundary*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) 397 (2011), Kraevye Zadachi Matematicheskoi Fiziki i Smezhnye Voprosy Teorii Funktsii. 42, 5–19, 172.

[36] V. Vyalov & T. Shilkin, *On the boundary regularity of weak solutions to the MHD system*, Zap. Nauchn. Sem. S.-Peterburg. Otdel. Mat. Inst. Steklov. (POMI) **385** (2010), Kraevye Zadachi Matematicheskoi Fiziki i Smezhnye Voprosy Teorii Funktsii. 41, 18–53, 234; translation in J. Math. Sci. (N. Y.) **178** (2011), no. 3, 243–264.

[37] W. Wang & Z. Zhang, *On the interior regularity criteria for suitable weak solutions of the Magneto-hydrodynamics equations*, preprint.

[38] J. Wolf, *On the boundary regularity of suitable weak solutions to the Navier-Stokes equations*, Ann. Univ. Ferrara Sez. VII Sci. Mat., **56** (2010), no. 1, 97–139

Kyungkeun Kang
Department of Mathematics
Yonsei University
Seoul, Republic of Korea
kkang@yonsei.ac.kr

Jae-Myoung Kim
Department of Mathematics
Sungkyunkwan University
Suwon, Republic of Korea
cauchy@skku.edu